1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	LINUTED OTATEO D	ACTRICT COURT
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
10	WILLIAM GIBBS and JOHN WAGNER,	
11	Plaintiffs,)) Case No. 2:13-cv-0935-RCJ-NJK
12		ORDER DENYING DISCOVERY PLAN
13	vs. RIVERS TRANSPORTATION GROUP, et al.,	(Docket No. 24)
14	RIVERS TRAINSFORTATION GROOT, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan and scheduling order (Docket	
17	No. 24), which is hereby DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall submit a revised discovery plan,	
18	no later than August 29, 2013, that complies with the Local Rules. Specifically, the parties are	
19	requesting a discovery period approximately 30 days longer than the typical 180 days from when the	
20	first defendant answered. Therefore, the parties must provide "a statement of the reasons why longer or	
21	different time periods should apply to the case" See LR 26-1(d).	
22	Additionally, it is the Court's preference that the parties specify that all requests to extend	
23	discovery deadlines must comply with LR 26-4. Under LR 26-4, requests to extend discovery	
24	deadlines must be filed at least 21 days before the expiration of the subject deadline sought to be	
25	extended. LR 26-4. A request made after the expiration of the subject deadline shall not be granted	
26	unless the movant demonstrates that the failure to act was the result of excusable neglect.	
27		
28		

Case 1:14-cv-00335-AJT-JFA Document 25 Filed 08/26/13 Page 1 of 2 PageID# 289

Although the Court is inclined to approve the deadlines set out in the parties' proposed discovery plan, the parties must comply with the Local Rules and must provide sufficient reasons for their delayed filing and extended deadlines.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 26, 2013

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge